1	William N. Sinclair (SBN 222502) (bsinclair@mdattorney.com)	
2	Steven D. Silverman (Admitted <i>Pro Hac Vice</i>) (ssilverman@mdattorney.com)	
3	Phillip J. Closius (Admitted <i>Pro Hac Vice</i>) (pclosius@ mdattorney.com)	
4	Alexander Williams (Admitted <i>Pro Hac Vice</i>) (awilliams@mdattorney.com)	
5	Andrew G. Slutkin (Admitted <i>Pro Hac Vice</i>) (aslutkin@mdattorney.com)	
6	Steven N. Leitess (Admitted <i>Pro Hac Vice</i>) (sleitess@mdattorney.com)	
7	SILVERMAN THOMPSON SLUTKIN WHI 201 N. Charles Street, Suite 2600	TEILLC
8	Baltimore, MD 21201	Charles A. Davidson (Adminst D., H., W.)
9	Telephone: (410) 385-2225 Facsimile: (410) 547-2432	Stuart A. Davidson (Admitted <i>Pro Hac Vice</i>) (sdavidson@rgrdlaw.com) Mark J. Dearman (Admitted <i>Pro Hac Vice</i>)
10	Thomas J. Byrne (SBN 179984) (tbyrne@nbolaw.com)	(mdearman@rgrdlaw.com) Jason H. Alperstein (Admitted <i>Pro Hac Vice</i>)
11	Mel T. Owens (SBN 226146) (mowens@nbolaw.com)	(jalperstein@rgrdlaw.com) ROBBINS GELLER RUDMAN
12	NAMANNY BYRNE & OWENS, P.C. 2 South Pointe Drive, Suite 245	& DOWD LLP 120 East Palmetto Park Road, Suite 500
13	Lake Forest, CA 92630 Telephone: (949) 452-0700	Boca Raton, FL 33432 Telephone: (561) 750-3000
14	Facsimile: (949) 452-0707	Facsimile: (561) 750-3364
15	Attorneys for Plaintiffs	
16		
17	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
18	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
19	SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION	
20	ETOPIA EVANS, as the Representative of the Estate of Charles Evans, et al.,	Case No. 3:16-cv-01030-WHA
21		
22	Plaintiffs,	PLAINTIFFS' ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION FOR LEAVE TO EXCEED
23	VS.	PAGE LIMITATIONS SET FORTH IN CIVIL LOCAL RULES 7-3(a) AND 7-4(b)
24	ARIZONA CARDINALS FOOTBALL CLUB, LLC, et al.,	
25	Defendants.	The Honorable William H. Alsup
26)
27		
28		
	PLAINTIFFS' ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION FOR	LEAVE TO EXCEED PAGE LIMITATIONS –

Case No. 3:16-cv-01030-WHA

Civil Local Rules 7-3(a) and 7-4(b).

RELIEF REQUESTED

7 8 9

6

Through this Motion, Plaintiffs seek entry of the [Proposed] Order Extending Page Limit for Briefing on Plaintiffs' Opposition to Defendants' Motion to Dismiss Amended Complaint ("Proposed Order"), filed herewith, which would permit Plaintiffs to file an Opposition not to exceed a total of 30 pages in length.

Pursuant to Local Rule 7-11, Plaintiffs respectfully request an order authorizing them to

file a memorandum in opposition ("Opposition") to Defendants' Motion to Dismiss and/or

Motion for Summary Judgment, due Monday, April 3, in excess of the 25-page limit set forth in

11

10

BACKGROUND

1213

14

15

16

Plaintiffs filed a 100-page-plus Second Amended Complaint alleging that Defendants, the 32 member clubs comprising the National Football League, committed intentional misrepresentations and concealed material facts relating to, *inter alia*, medications their employees and/or agents provided to Plaintiffs and a putative class of similarly situated persons. Defendants have moved to dismiss that complaint and/or seek summary judgment as to those claims, raising a host of complex arguments regarding the sufficiency of Plaintiffs' claims and whether they are time-barred.

17 18

19

20

21

2223

24

2526

27

28

Civil Local Rules 7-3(a) and 7-4(b) provide that opposition memoranda shall not exceed 25 pages of text, which can be enlarged at the Court's discretion. *See* Civil Local Rule 7-11 (referencing "motions to exceed otherwise applicable page limitations"). Plaintiffs respectfully request that they be granted leave of Court to exceed these page limitations for good cause. Defendants have filed two motions and, at least with regard to the motion to dismiss, have raised a number of issues, including the appropriate standard and what effect this Court's prior PLAINTIFFS' ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION FOR LEAVE TO EXCEED PAGE

ARGUMENT

decisions has on the applicable pleading standard, and requires a claim by claim analysis that only lengthens a response. As to the motion for summary judgment, while predicated on a single issue, that issue is nuanced and requires evidentiary support from deposition transcripts and interrogatory answers, which again only lengthens a response. The foregoing notwithstanding, Plaintiffs are optimistic they can keep their response to 25 pages, and if they can, they will, but discretion being the better part of valor, Plaintiffs file this motion to ensure they comprehensively address the complex issues raised by the Defendants in their motion.

Defendants do not oppose Plaintiffs' request (Declaration of William N. Sincliar, ¶¶6-7, filed herewith).

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Plaintiffs respectfully request that the Court enter an Order granting the relief requested herein.

DATED: March 31, 2017 William N. Sinclair Steven D. Silverman Phillip J. Closius Alexander Williams Andrew G. Slutkin Steven D. Leitess

SILVERMAN|THOMPSON|SLUTKIN|WHITE|LLC

William N. Sinclair (SBN 222502) (bsinclair@mdattorney.com) 201 N. Charles St., Suite 2600 Baltimore, MD 21201

Telephone: (410) 385-2225 Facsimile: (410) 547-2432

Thomas J. Byrne Mel T. Owens

NAMANNY BYRNE & OWENS, P.C.

2 South Pointe Drive, Suite 245

Lake Forest, CA 92630 Telephone: (949) 452-0700 Facsimile: (949) 452-0707

28

27

1	Stuart A. Davidson Mark J. Dearman
2	Jason H. Alperstein ROBBINS GELLER RUDMAN
3	& DOWD LLP
4	120 East Palmetto Park Road, Suite 500 Boca Raton, FL 33432
5	Telephone: (561) 750-3000 Facsimile: (561) 750-3364
6	Rachel L. Jensen (SBN 211456)
7	ROBBINS GELLER RUDMÁN & DOWD LLP
8	655 West Broadway, Suite 1900
9	San Diego, CA 92101 Telephone: (619) 231-1058
10	Facsimile: (619) 231-7423
11	Attorneys for Plaintiffs
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19 20	
$\begin{bmatrix} 20 \\ 21 \end{bmatrix}$	
$\begin{bmatrix} 21 \\ 22 \end{bmatrix}$	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
_	